

On duty they owe not only to the States whose institutions are assailed, but to the Union and Constitution, as has been shown, and it may be added, to themselves. The sober and considerate portions of citizens of the non-slaveholding States, who have a deep stake in the existing institutions of the country, would have little forecast not to see that the assaults which are now directed against the institutions of the Southern States may be very easily directed against those which uphold their own property and security. A very slight modification of the arguments used against the institutions which sustain the property and security of the South, would make them equally effective against the institutions of the north, including banking, in which so vast an amount of capital and property is invested. It would be well for those interested to reflect whether there exists, or ever has existed, a wealthy and civilized community, in which one portion did not live on the labor of another; and whether the form in which slavery exists in the South is not but one modification of this universal condition; and finally, whether any other, under all the circumstances of the case, is more defensible, or stands on stronger ground of necessity. It is time to look these questions in the face.

Let those who are interested remember that labor is the only source of wealth, and how small a portion of it, in all old and civilized countries, even the best governed, is left to those by whose labor wealth is created. Let them also reflect how little volition or agency the operatives in any country have, in the question of its distribution—as little, with a few exceptions, as the African of the slaveholding States has, in the distribution of the proceeds of his labor. Nor is it the less oppressive, than in the one case it is effected by the stern will of the Government, and in the other by the more feeble and flexible will of a master. If one be an evil, so is the other. The only difference is the amount and mode of the exaction and distribution, and the agency by which they are effected.

#### LETTERS TO MR. HALLETT.

No. 2.

FEBRUARY, 1836.

To B. F. HALLETT, Esq.

SIR: Though proceeding to reply to the letters signed by "A Massachusetts Antimason," I address myself to you, because you have, for what purposes it does not concern me to inquire, put forward this unknown personage as your substitute. When I say "you," therefore, in this and the following letters, I shall mean the "compound" formed by the union of the Editor of the Boston Advocate with the man who deems it prudent to mask his identity under the cover of a fictitious signature.

You begin by complaining that I "do not come to the point," that is, to the point of naming a candidate for the Presidency; but that I "consume sixteen pages in the discussion of general principles." I cannot, surely, blame you for feeling restive under a discussion of principles which you have made up your mind to abandon; nor for your desiring to force me from an investigation of those principles, as connected with the proposed election of Mr Van Buren, to the invidious office of proposing my own candidate for the Presidency. When the resolutions in question were adopted, and when I addressed you, it was the general expectation that there would be a National Convention to deliberate on, and decide, the question who should be the candidate of the Antimasons of the United States. To report resolutions containing an assertion of the principles which should be kept in view in preparing for, and acting in, that Convention, and to address you and the public in explanation and support of those principles, must, I think, seem quite proper to all who are disposed to be governed by any principles other than those of self-interest. It was easy to determine who should not be the candidate to carry out the principles avowed in the resolutions and explained in my letters. Martin Van Buren could not be, because he was publicly pledged to a course of measures utterly at variance with them. To support him, therefore, would be to give up the principles for which the Antimasons of Vermont and the whole country had long contended. To determine, however, who should be the candidate, was a matter of more difficulty and one with the decision of which I did not feel disposed to interfere, choosing to leave it where the party had, I supposed, by common consent, left it, to be decided, upon full deliberation, in a national convention.

Thus, after advertizing, at the close of my first letter, to the resolution of the meeting, that "the ground should be firmly taken and steadfastly maintained, that the selection of men for office should be made subservient to the support of principles, and not the selection of principles subservient to the elevation of men;" and saying, when the proper time shall arrive, I think I may safely assure you that they (the Vermont Antimasons) will not abandon their old principles and adopt new ones for the sake of aiding in the elevation of Mr Van Buren to the Presidency. I added, "Do you ask me whose elevation they will aid? My reply is, that of some man who, while he shall be qualified by age, experience, talents, temper, and moral principle, to become the depository of a nation's confidence, shall be known as an opponent both of secret societies and of the misrule of the present administration. There may, and doubtless will, be differences of opinion as to the man who should be selected. On this, as on all other similar occasions, there must be a spirit of mutual concession and compromise, not of principle, but of personal preferences, for the sake of promoting the public good. Such a spirit, I trust, will not be wanting whenever and wherever Antimasons are brought to act upon this great question, under a direct responsibility to their country and the world."

The determination thus evinced by me, to stand by the great principles avowed by the Antimasonic party, and await the action of a national convention to carry them out, as far as practicable, in the selection of a candidate for the Presidency, you are pleased to characterize as "procrastination," the "resource for all wavering minds," and an "attempt to get over giving an opinion, by leaving to a national convention, what would be just as difficult to decide at the time of its meeting as it is now."

And here, sir, you have, in part, disclosed the true secret of your hostility to the resolutions which I reported. They contem-

plated a national convention, which you had been insidiously laboring for months to prevent; and they reiterated the principles which we had before avowed, and reiterated them for the purpose, as expressed in the preamble, of deciding whether we would, with the firmness and constancy of Antimasons, maintain and carry them out, in the approaching contest. To talk of "principles" and of "firmness and constancy" in carrying them out," grated harshly on your ears, and promised no aid in the consummation of your scheme of dividing, distracting, and destroying the Antimasonic party, to the end that you might, the more effectually, accomplish the long meditated purpose of carrying it over in detail, to the ranks of your new allies. You well knew that in a national convention these principles would be discussed; and you knew that, in such a convention, formed so as fairly to represent the Antimasons of the United States, the candidate to whose interest you had transferred yourself, could, in no probable event, be nominated. Resolutions which talked about "principles," and "firmness and constancy," and a National Convention, you very readily perceived had a train by which all your plans might be exploded and all your hopes dashed.

The truth was, sir, I did come to the point—and the true point. And that was the very reason why I met with opposition from yourself, and your coadjutors. It was the point of asserting our old principles, maintaining our old ground, and coming to the resolution to walk in the good old way. To show that this was a safe way, I adverted to the unanimous support given to Mr Wirt in 1833; and urged the importance of maintaining the same combination of principles now which was so happily bodied forth in the support given to him on that occasion. But, to avoid the force of this suggestion, you contend that the present state of things is very different from that of 1833. How different? Then, you and I wanted to express, in the election of a President, our disapprobation of masonry. Mr Wirt decidedly expressed such disapprobation; and he was selected as the candidate. And has it ceased to be of any importance that such disapprobation should be expressed? I do not think so; whatever you may think upon the subject. But was disapprobation of masonry the only inducement to the support of Mr Wirt? You know, sir, it was not. What did you write and publish to the world, as the sentiments of the Antimasonic Convention of Massachusetts, on that occasion? I embodied it in a postscript to my last letter to you, and I now repeat it:

"We hold the national welfare, and the purity of our national institutions, as a paramount consideration; calling upon all citizens to unite in ridding the country of the MISRULE OF JACKSONISM, and the MISRULE OF FREEMASONRY. The incompetency of the present Chief Magistrate, surrounded as he is by the worst influences, and his DEPARTURE FROM THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES ON WHICH ALL FORMER ADMINISTRATIONS HAVE BEEN CONDUCTED, would, in the event of his re-election, almost compel us to doubt of the capacity of the people for sound discrimination in self-government."

The "national welfare, and the purity of our national institutions," were with you, then, the "paramount consideration," as they ought to be; and they called, in your opinion, upon all citizens to unite in ridding the country, not only of the "misrule of freemasonry," but of the "misrule of Jacksonism" also. This looks very much like making it a question of principle, as indeed it was. It now suits your purpose, however, to represent the selection of Mr Wirt as intended merely to secure a cooperation of one of the organized divisions in the country, which had fixed upon a candidate, and whose co-operation "would have given a reasonable prospect of success." But what an admission do you here make? In what a strange position do you place our party and its candidate, on that occasion, when you represent it as selecting him from the ranks of the national republican party, for the purpose of securing its support; and yet without any regard, real or professed, to its principles, or those, touching the subject of national policy, of the candidate whom we had selected?

But, as though it has entirely changed the state of things since 1833, you speak of the manner in which "that course" of the Antimasons "was met, and prostrated and betrayed," by the party to which Mr Wirt belonged. But how does this affect the question of our duty now? If we selected Mr Wirt, upon the ground of finding in him a representative of the principles of Antimasonry and Anti-Jacksonism, did the want of a "co-operation" affect, at all, the correctness of our decision? If others failed to co-operate, on them be the responsibility. However wrong they may have acted, our principle was right; and if it was right then, it is right now, unless a most rapid and alarming increase of the "misrule of Jacksonism" has diminished, and, in fact, annihilated the necessity of uniting in "ridding the country" of it.

But you see a pertinent difference between 1833 and the present time, in the fact that there is now an abundance of Antimasonic letters; by which you refer, I suppose, to the letters of Mr Webster, Gen. Harrison, and Judge White, disclosing their opposition to masonry. And does this dispense with the importance of a National Convention? Least of all—does it justify us in turning aside from all those who have frankly done homage to our principles, to take up a man who, though asked to come out, plays non-committal, lest he should offend the hosts of adhering masons, who are yielding him their vigorous support?

But you say a National Convention could not agree if one should be held. Now, I must admit, sir, that, on this point, you are tolerably good authority. No man, I presume, better knows than yourself, the extent to which the elements of discord prevail in the Antimasonic ranks, for no one has done more than yourself to give them an active and efficient existence. If any one has a right to say that a National Convention cannot be held, you certainly have; for, with the aid of a few kindred spirits, you have, I believe, fully succeeded in defeating it. As this is a point of considerable importance, I shall reserve its consideration to another letter.

I am, &c. W. SLADE.

[The resolutions referred to in the foregoing letter, are those adopted at an Antimasonic meeting of Members of the Legislature, and others, in October last.]—Ed.



## THE STATE JOURNAL.

CHAUNCEY L. KNAPP, EDITOR.

MONTPELIER, MARCH 8, 1836.

### ANTIMASONIC NOMINATIONS.

FOR PRESIDENT,  
**WM. HENRY HARRISON**  
Of Ohio.  
FOR VICE PRESIDENT,  
**FRANCIS GRANGER**  
Of New York.

### ANTIMASONIC ELECTORAL TICKET.

JABEZ PROCTOR, { Electors at large.  
ASA ALDIS, {  
Dist. No. 1, DAVID CRAWFORD,  
2, ZIMM HOWE,  
3, TITUS HUTCHINSON,  
4, WM. A. GRISWOLD,  
5, EZRA BUTLER.

### ANTIMASONIC STATE TICKET.

FOR GOVERNOR,

**SILAS H. JENISON.**

FOR LT. GOVERNOR,

**DAVID M. CAMP.**

FOR TREASURER,

**AUGUSTINE CLARKE.**

### THE CONVENTION.

We gave our readers last week what was believed to be a fair and impartial account of the doings of the late State Convention. So far as we have been enabled to learn, the nominations are hailed with approbation by the great mass of the Antimasonic party, who did not participate in the proceedings. Perfect unanimity was not expected. Nor was it expected that those, who had long since committed themselves in favor of Van Burenism, and had positively refused, before the meeting of the Convention, to acquiesce in any other nomination, if made, would be found with us, sustaining the regular nominations and giving currency to the decisions and wishes of the majority. Accordingly we have not been disappointed on learning that an "inconsiderable number" of the members of the Antimasonic convention, after the nominations were made, retired to an upper room at Cottrell's Hotel and nominated not only Mr Van Buren, but distinct tickets for State Officers and Electors, with the exception of Mr Clarke for Treasurer, and Mr Aldis for an Elector. This irregular and unprecedented movement would probably have received no notice from us, but for the circumstance that the principal actor in the affair has thought proper to represent the proceedings of the Antimasonic Convention in such a light as to afford some show of justification for presenting a string of minority nominations for the support of the Antimasons of Vermont.

Mr Barber, in the last Free Press, after hoisting the Van Buren flag at the head of that journal, proceeds to give what purports to be a history of the proceedings of the two conventions, and of the facts and circumstances attending their deliberations, winding up with an exhortation to the Antimasons of Vermont to "cut loose from the Harrison nominations," or in other words, to abandon the nominations deliberately made by an Antimasonic State Convention, and flank off in the train of 27 dissenting members!

Mr Barber's apology for presenting an opposition ticket is as follows:

"Our readers will perceive by the tickets which we publish to-day, that the members of the late Antimasonic Convention were divided in opinion as to the course which should be adopted. The majority of that convention saw fit to nominate the ticket headed by Wm. H. Harrison, for President, which ticket was adopted throughout by the Whig Convention. The minority of the Antimasonic Convention, considering that the nomination of Gen. Harrison by the majority, was a virtual disbanding of the party, or in other words, a transforming it from an Antimasonic into a Whig party, withdrew and nominated a separate ticket."

What a pity that the Convention did not follow Mr Barber's advice and nominate that illustrious Antimason, Mr Van Buren! The identity of the Antimasonic party would thus have been nicely preserved, and our good friends saved the trouble of "disbanding," you see. But how is it, that the nomination of General Harrison by a vote of 104 to 40, was "a transforming of the Antimasons into a Whig party"? What are the positions taken by Gen. Harrison in regard to the masonic institution?

1. That he regards the existence of freemasonry as "an evil, both moral and political."  
2. That, "in the exercise of the elective franchise, the people possess the means of correcting all the evils which may arise in our Government; and that it ought to be used for that purpose."  
3. That the question with regard to the

suppression of freemasonry is "a domestic concern of the States;" that it properly appertains to the power of the people themselves, or the "authority of the State Governments;" and that it would be dangerous to commit it to the General Government or any of its departments; and

4. That "appointments by the President should be made upon the good old rules of Jefferson—"honesty, capacity, and fidelity to the constitution; and that they should be acceptable to the People for whom they are immediately to act."

This is substantially the ground occupied by Antimasons from the beginning. It is, as Mr Slade justly remarks, substantially the ground taken by Mr Wirt in his letter accepting the anti-masonic nomination in 1831. Mr Wirt was as little disposed as is General Harrison to attempt to correct the evil of freemasonry by the exercise of the removing and appointing power of the President of the United States. General Harrison distinctly admits the propriety of putting down freemasonry at the ballot box and by State legislation. Yet who can produce any evidence that Mr Van Buren is even morally opposed to freemasonry?

Mr Barber proceeds:

While they [the minority] would have felt bound to adhere to the nomination of any member of their own party for President, independent of all other candidates, they could not consent to be transferred over to the ranks of modern Whiggism, by the vote of a convention which they could not consider as fairly representing the views and feelings of a majority of their party.

Let it be remembered, the only candidate not avowedly Antimasonic, who received any support in the Convention, was Martin Van Buren. On the balloting for President,

Mr Harrison, an Antimason, had 87;  
Mr Webster, an Antimason, had 28;  
Mr Granger, an Antimason, had 20;  
Mr Everett, an Antimason, had 1;  
Mr Van Buren, non-committal, had 27!

And yet we are told, forthwith, that had the convention nominated an Antimason, why the minority, who voted for Mr Van Buren, "would have felt bound to adhere to the nomination"! What does this mean? Is it not singular ground for a minority voting under such circumstances, to assume that those who voted throughout for Antimasonic candidates, misrepresented "the views and feelings of a majority of their party"? We have yet to learn that the support of Van Buren non-committalism is the test of fidelity to the cause of Antimasonry. We are rather disposed to adopt the emphatic language of Mr Barber himself, that

"Neither Masonry nor VAN BURENISM, nor both can succeed with the Green Mountain Boys. POLITICAL JUGGLING will run a short race among the descendants of Ethan Allen."—(Free Press, July 1, 1833.)

Again:

We believe that a majority of the Antimasons of this State preferred in the first place, that the party should keep entirely distinct from both the other parties, if possible; and if not, to have, in the second place, no connection whatever with the Whigs.

Yet who has been foremost in courting an alliance between Antimasons and another party, by making overtures and erecting "platforms" for the consummation of such a purpose? Who were the first to take an attitude of preliminary defiance against the nomination of any and every candidate, except Mr Van Buren?

Of the four candidates now before the public for President, we believe a majority would prefer Mr Webster, as a first choice of evils, and he being out of the question, would have chosen next to him, Mr Van Buren.

Indeed! Upon what evidence is this opinion of Martin Van Buren's popularity among "the descendants of Allen," predicated? How long have they been wedded to his system of non-committalism and "political juggling"? The North Star and Free Press have for some months been sounding the praise of Mr Van Buren—yet how many supporters were found for him in Convention from the counties of Caledonia and Addison? Precisely two from the former, and three or four from the latter! If Mr Van Buren's admirers are so plenty among the Antimasons, why in the name of wonder did they not come up to the Convention and do battle for him? Why were they among the missing at the roll-call? The doors of the convention, according to previous custom were thrown open to "all opposed to secret societies in principle and practice."

An informal meeting was held, at which a committee of one from each county represented, was appointed to make nominations of officers of the convention. A majority of the committee were Harrison men. This committee being organized, Lt. Gov. Egerton, one of the earliest Antimasons in the State, who had frequently presided at conventions of the party, was nominated as a candidate for President. The vote being taken he was rejected by the majority of the committee, without the assignment of a single reason for the step!

Shocking calamity! Who ever before supposed it to be necessary to offer reasons in such a case? What especial claim had Mr Egerton to the Chair of the Convention above Mr Howe or any other competent member? Did the claim rest on the fact of Mr Egerton's participating in the proceedings of a Jackson caucus in January, when he openly declared for Mr Van Buren, against all other candidates? When Mr

Richard Rush took part, in like manner in a Jackson meeting in Pennsylvania, Mr Barber was the first man to brand him as a deserter. We trust Mr Barber will not be too censorious upon the Convention for following a precedent so unquestionable.

The Whig influence manifested itself in a striking manner on the question of Lieut. Governor. No man, we should suppose, would have been more acceptable to the Antimasons than Martin Flint.

Was it not understood that Gen. Flint would not consent to be a candidate? He has repeatedly refused, to our knowledge, when pressed to accept of such a nomination. But why should Mr Barber be so anxious to have General Flint nominated, pledged as he is to support the nominations of the majority?

Mr Knapp, in support of the nomination of Gen. Harrison, produced and read a letter from Hon. William Slade, which he said was intended to be laid before the Convention. The letter was evidently designed to point out the course for the Convention to pursue.

Mr Knapp made no such remark as is here imputed to him. Mr Slade expressed no wish to have his letter read in the convention or elsewhere. As it contained a refutation of a slanderous and false report against Gen. Harrison's character, we took leave to read an extract, embracing that refutation. If it was proper for Mr Barber to read letters from citizens of Pennsylvania and New York, was it not tolerable in us to read a letter from a distinguished Antimason of our own State—from a man, too, whose opinions are held in the highest estimation? We repeat, the letter was not read by request of the writer, but of our own free will and pleasure.

The Convention learned moreover, thro' Mr Knapp, that all the Vermont delegation in Congress had had a meeting and had concluded that it was best for that Convention to nominate Harrison. These things show what sort of influence was brought to bear upon the Convention.

How, when and where did the Convention learn this from Mr Knapp? We said nothing, we knew nothing of any meeting of the kind. Our friend makes tragical work at reporting.

Some opinion may be formed of the influence which was operating upon the Convention, when it is understood that Mr Knapp had declared that he could not support Gen. Harrison, both in his paper and in public conversations, within a very short period before the assembling of the Convention.

These charges were brought against us in the Convention. We promptly replied to them on the spot, to the satisfaction as we thought, of the gentleman who now reiterates them, still more publicly. We here repeat, that we did oppose the nomination of Gen. Harrison, at a meeting held at the Court House in this town during the session of the Constitutional Convention. That meeting was thinly attended, and no public notice had been given of the intended agitation of the Presidential question. We opposed the nomination mainly on the ground that any nomination, made under the circumstances of that meeting, could not be regarded as a fair and full expression of the party. We then proposed a State Convention for the purpose, among other things, of getting a fair and full expression from the People on the question of the Presidency. [This proposition was then resisted by Mr Barber—and after the State Committee had resolved to call a convention, they were strongly importuned by Mr Barber to desist from their purpose. The reason of this importunity is now too obvious to be made a matter of conjecture.] As to our having said, on any occasion, that we could not support Gen. Harrison, that is another mistake of the reporter.

The Whig convention, after having organized, immediately adjourned to attend upon the deliberations of the Antimasonic convention. The lobbies and gallery were crowded with them, and many hesitated not to take seats on the floor of the hall among the Antimasons.

As to when the Whig convention met, or when they adjourned, we took no notice. Nor did we observe one of their number occupying a seat with the members of our convention. At one time, when there was a crowd in the lobby, they were invited by Mr Pettibone, to take seats in the rear of the Speaker's Chair. Numbers availed themselves of the liberty thus offered them, but without at all attempting, so far as we observed, to intermeddle with our doings.

The Free Press singles out free individuals, out of 165, who are represented as not properly belonging to the Antimasonic party, and who acted with us in the Convention. Suppose there were so many of this character; can any man acquainted with the Antimasons of Vermont deny that the great body of the delegates were honest and faithful representatives of the party?

We have attended every Antimasonic State Convention since 1829 (with the exception of one, when we were in another State), and we feel warranted in saying that a more honest, intelligent and impartial representation of the Antimasonic People of Vermont, has never assembled in this town; and this opinion is fully concurred in by various gentlemen with whom we have conversed, and who have had sufficient opportunities to judge correctly.

More anon, if necessity require.

AT LAST!  
A prospectus for the North Star has been briskly circulating for several days among the Van Buren men of this town. We are also assured that the Star is about to hoist the Van Buren flag. Be it so. We say to our friends at the North, Stick to your principles! If your standard-bearers go over to the Dutch, let it be the signal for renewed efforts, commensurate with the importance of our cause.

### "THE CONSTITUTION."

We have received the prospectus of a new Antimasonic paper, to be published at Woodstock, under the above title. It will support HARRISON and GRANGER, with the other nominations of the Antimasonic party.

### FROM HEAD-QUARTERS!

The Ontario Freeman, which has always maintained its integrity as a sound Antimasonic journal, amidst all the fluctuations of New York politics, contains the proceedings of a Democratic Antimasonic County Convention recently held at Canandaigua, the residence of our candidate for Vice President, HARRISON and GRANGER were nominated with enthusiasm. The Freeman notices the meeting in the following emphatic terms:

We give to-day, the proceedings of the Democratic Antimasonic County Convention, and the Address accompanying the same, which will be read with deep interest. The Convention was a very full one, all the towns being represented. The Address and Resolutions were listened to with deep interest, received and adopted by the Convention with one unanimous burst of applause and satisfaction. Never was a Convention more unanimous—Delegates and spectators all vied with each other in expressing their approbation—the large room in which they met was crowded more than at any other period within our recollection.

The Freeman who attended this Convention acted as Freeman should—they waived their individual preferences for men, and expressed their determination to go shoulder to shoulder in the support of pure Democratic principles—measures not men—equal political rights—opposition to Freemasonry and all other secret societies in whatever shape or form they may assume. We call upon the Freeman of the state of New York to come up with us to the rescue of the Constitution, and save that precious instrument from the iron grasp of those who would scatter it to the four winds of heaven, and destroy the dear bought rights for which our fathers bled and died. Brethren of the east, north and south—permit us to call upon you to arouse from your slumbers—a voice from Steuben already cries we come; the southern tier of counties are on the alert; we shall soon see them moving in solid columns for Harrison and Granger—the west, the truly democratic west, will do their duty—they go for Harrison and Granger, and like their brethren of Pennsylvania, they spurn the collar and the cable-tow, and all Masonic dictation.

We notice that some of the Van Buren oracles, in the absence of any valid objection to Gen. Harrison, are attempting to connect him with the advocacy of the old Alien and Sedition Law, while in Congress. Let us have the proof, gentlemen. Our belief is, that he was not in Congress at the time that law was passed. Our scrupulous objectors, by the way, are dumb as adders in view of the far more odious proposition for a gag-law, now before the Senate with the approbation of Andrew Jackson and the leading Van Buren men in Congress!

### MR HALLETT'S MANOEUVRE.

The following article from the Greenfield Mercury will shed some additional light on "the mode and the manner" in which the pretended nomination of Mr Van Buren by the Antimasons of Massachusetts was effected:

The Antimasons of Franklin. Two or three weeks ago, a Convention purporting to be an Antimasonic Legislative Convention, and composed in fact, of Suffolk Antimasons and Jackson men, with a sprinkling of the half-fund-half Antimasons of Middlesex, and Bristol, met and passed a series of resolutions, nominating Martin Van Buren for the Presidency. We were satisfied at the time that this nomination could not be assented to by the original Antimasons of this quarter, who had repeatedly and publicly expressed their abhorrence of the acts and policy of the administration of which Van Buren is the legitimate representative. It is with great pleasure that we are enabled to state that of the nine original Antimasons who are now in the Legislature from this county, eight at least have maintained the honorable consistency which might have been expected of them, have refused to be sold by the Boston leaders, and are known to be politically attached to the great defender of the Constitution. That there may be no ambiguity, we annex the names of the Antimasonic representatives from this county:

Ephraim Hoyt, Stephen Whitney, Deerfield; Thomas Longley, Hawley; Charles E. Billings, Conway; S. H. Reed, Rowe; Hawes, Buckland; ———— Sawyer, Wendell; Joseph Smith, Colerain; Joseph Adams, Slutesbury.

This is the Antimasonic representation from this county; and we may say without fear of contradiction that there is no representation of the same number from any county, which surpasses this in talent, in good sense, or in sound patriotism. Every one of them, (with a single exception,) adhering to the Antimasonic declaration of 1832, which called on "all good citizens to unite in ridding the country of the evils of Jacksonism," feels himself bound to oppose the man who has pledged himself to follow out the acts of his predecessor, and tread in his footsteps. We believe that their determination is a correct index of the feelings of the great body of the conscientious Antimasons of this county.